



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_17377
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutrient Digestibility, Retention and Growth Performance of Finisher Broilers Given <i>Xylopi</i> <i>aethiopica</i> Dried Fruits (Grains of Selim) As Additive
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Line 2-3: The title of the article should be changed to 'Nutrient digestibility and growth performance of finisher broilers fed dried <i>Xylopi aethiopica</i> fruits (Grains of Selim) as additive' Line 9: Replace 'given' with 'fed'. Line 10: why did the authors used finisher broilers? Line 12: delete 'well' Line 13: insert 'respectively' after per litre Line 17-20: The concluding sentence should be deleted and replaced with 'Results of this study demonstrated that grains of Selim could be used as a substitute for antibiotic growth promoter in the diet of broiler finishers' Line 30: Replace '[4]' with 'Isikwenu [4]' at the beginning of the second sentence Line 32: Replace 'resulted in' with 'exhibited' Line 32: Replace '[4]' with 'Isikwenu [4]' at the beginning of the second sentence Line 41: Was the study conducted in line with animal welfare and ethics guidelines? If so include statement of compliance and approval by the animal welfare and ethics committee. Line 44: State the weight of the birds as mean± standard error.	Suggested title accepted but the word 'fed' cannot be used because the test ingredient was not mixed with the feed. It was not 'fed' but given in drinking water as it was dissolved in water. All suggested corrections have been done. Observations on number of birds used in metabolic trials is noted. However, the use of birds around the average weight of the population has taken care of errors that might have arisen from low numbers. Conclusion simply stated that the spice <i>Xylopi aethiopica</i> dried fruits is as effective as antibiotics growth promoters since measured parameters were not significantly different.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 47: Replace the word ‘shared’ with ‘assigned’ or ‘allotted’ Line 55-57: Delete the sentence ‘Grain of selim was used to replace antibiotics in the drinking water of finisher broilers in treatments 2, 3, 4 and 5 whenever birds in treatment 1 were given antibiotics’. It is a repetition of the preceding sentence. Line 59: What do you mean by ‘recorded on replicate basis weekly’ please recast the sentence. Line 62: Why choose 1 bird per replicate for the metabolism trial? Is this scientifically and statistically sound?. This is the major flaw of this study. Choosing 1 bird/replicate i.e 3 birds/treatment is not statistically sound. That means 7.7% of birds in each treatment were used for metabolic trial. Hence, the data presented for the metabolic trial is unreliable because 7.7% may not be a true reflection of the population. Line 72: Replace ‘according to the procedure of [6]’ with according to AOAC [6] procedure’ Line 73: Replace ‘[7] and [8]’ with Sofowora [7] and Trease and Evans [8]. Line 75: Replace ‘[9]’ to ‘SPSS [9] statistical package and state the year in the reference list. Line 87-88: replace ‘’ in all the treatment groups’ with across the treatments groups’ Line 88: The second statement is not true and should be deleted. There were no significant	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	differences among the treatments. Line 91-92: Table 4-Only results for nutrient digestibility was presented. What about nutrient retention? It is wrong to assume that readers know the relationship between nutrient digestibility and retention. Thus, the word 'retention' should be deleted from the title and elsewhere. Line 101-102: Replace the sentence' [13, 14, 15, 16] also reported similar findings when they carried out phytochemical screening of <i>Xylopi aethiopica</i> oil and observed the presence of plant sterols and phenolic compounds such as flavonoids, tannins and the saponins' with 'In line with the present observation, phytochemical screening of <i>Xylopi aethiopica</i> oil revealed the presence of plant sterols and phenolic compounds such as flavonoids, tannins and the saponins [13, 14, 15, 16]. Line 161: Replace '[4]' with Isikwenu [4]. Line 163-164: Replace '[17, 18, 19, 20] who reported that garlic (powder or aqueous extract) as an additive in broiler production produced improved body weight gain, daily feed intake and feed conversion ratio' with 'Similarly, improved body weight gain, daily feed intake and feed conversion ratio was observed in broilers fed powder or aqueous extract of garlic compared to those fed control diet [17, 18, 19, 20]. Line 165-166: Replace 'The result of this study is also in line with the findings of [21, 22, 23, 24, 25] who reported improved body weight gain in broilers when ginger (<i>Zingiber officinale</i>, a spice) was used at different rates in feed or drinking water as an additive' with 'In addition, dietary ginger [21, 22, 23, 24, 25] and thyme [26, 27, 28, 29, 30] improved body weight gain in broilers' Line 168-169: Delete.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 173: Replace 'Isikwenu, 2014' with '[4]' Line 173-176. Delete the second statement because there were no significant differences across dietary treatments. However, you can state that grains of selim could replace antibiotics in broiler finishers. Line 177: No data was presented on nutrient retention. See further comments on Line 91-92. Line 181: delete the second sentence. Statistical analysis was not significant. Line 188-192: Recast the conclusion section to reflect the actual findings. Don't speculate.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		